

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 remain in the present application. Claims 13-22 are cancelled herein in response to the restriction requirement. Claim 5 is amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendment. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Election Without Traverse Between Species 1, Species 2 and Species 3

In the Office Action mailed December 16, 2005 for the above-captioned patent application, the Examiner stated that the present Application contains three distinct species. Accordingly, the Examiner has required the Applicants to elect a single species for prosecution on the merits.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants elect without traverse Species 1 recited in Claims 1-8, drawn to a method of processing a signal.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 5 is amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 complies with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in light of the claim amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,256,064 to Chujoh et al. (hereafter referred to as “Chujoh”). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chujoh for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites method of processing a signal comprising (emphasis added):

- a) reading a first bit section from a bit stream of variable length codes beginning at a reference bit of said bit stream;
- b) reading a second bit section from said bit stream beginning at a first offset from said reference bit of said bit stream, wherein steps a) and b) are done in parallel;
- c) indexing a table with said first bit section to obtain a first look-up result, said table comprising a plurality of variable length codes and a corresponding plurality of code lengths, said first look-up result describing the length of a first symbol in said bit stream;
- d) indexing said table with said second bit section to obtain a second look-up result, wherein steps c) and d) are done in parallel;
- e) determining if said second look-up result from step d) is valid; and
- f) accepting said second look-up result if it is valid, wherein said second look-up result describes a second symbol length in said bit stream.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chujoh fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein steps a) and b) are done in parallel” and “wherein steps c) and d) are done in parallel” as recited in independent Claim 1. The present application discloses that a first bit section and a second bit section are read from a bit stream in parallel. Similarly, a table is indexed with the first and second bit sections to obtain a first and second look-up result in parallel.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Chujoh to teach forward decoding independent of reverse decoding (Figure 28). Specifically, Chujoh teaches in lines 55-58 of column 21: “When it is determined that an error has been detected, the decoder 124 switches the code-word table in the code-word table switch 123 from the forward code-word table 111 to the backward code-word table 112.” Assuming *arguendo* that forward decoding is analogous to reading and indexing based upon a first bit section as claimed, and also assuming *arguendo* that reverse decoding is analogous to reading and indexing based upon a second bit section, then Chujoh fails to teach or suggest parallel reading and indexing as claimed. Moreover, by teaching independent decoding rather than parallel reading and indexing as claimed, Chujoh explicitly teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Chujoh also fails to teach or suggest the limitation “advancing the reference bit of said bit stream by the sum of said first and second symbol lengths” as recited in Claim 2. Whereas the present application claims advancing a reference bit by the sum

of a first and second symbol length, Applicants respectfully submit that Chujoh is silent with respect to such a limitation.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chujoh, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record. Since dependent Claims 2-5 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 2-5 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chujoh. Thus, Claims 1-5 are therefore allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chujoh. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6-8 are not rendered obvious by Chujoh given the deficiencies pointed out above with regard to independent Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-8, which depend from allowable independent Claim 1, overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Thus, Claims 6-8 are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 3/13, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060